

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in substantially the same order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-12 are pending. Claims 1-12 are currently amended to more clearly define pre-existing claim limitations. No claims are canceled. No claims are added. No new matter has been added.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 4-12 stand objected to under CFR 1.75(c) as being improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only and cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,272,929 to Hanson (hereinafter "Hanson") in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA").

Response to Objections

Claims 4-12 stands objected to because of informalities. In particular, the Office Action states that a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only and cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4-12 have been amended so that there are no multiple dependent claims that depend from any other multiple dependent claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 4-12 be withdrawn.

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Hanson in view of AAPA. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections

because the combination of cited references fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims.

CLAIMS 1-3

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of AAPA. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of cited references because the combination does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A tower, in particular for a wind energy turbine, comprising:
a first tower segment having a wall comprising concrete material and
a second tower segment having a wall comprising steel,
wherein the wall of the second tower segment comprises **an end portion embedded in an embedment portion of the wall of the first tower segment**, and
wherein the second tower segment within its embedded end portion comprises a plurality of anchoring elements projecting radially from an inner or an outer surface or both inner and outer surfaces of the wall of the second tower segment, **the plurality of anchoring elements being arranged along an axial direction of the second tower segment to prevent internal force concentrations within the wall of the first tower segment.**
(Emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 requires the embedded end portion of the second tower segment includes multiple anchoring elements projecting radially, and arranged along an axial direction of the second tower segment to prevent internal force concentrations within the wall of the first tower segment. Hanson and AAPA, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least this limitation of the claim.

Hanson is directed to a tower for a wind generator, the tower having multiple segments, where each segment fits into the one below it. The lower segment is anchored in the ground and includes a stirrup which holds the lowest section of the tower a distance above the bottom of the hole so that when cement is poured into the hole to anchor the tower, the cement flows up into the interior of the tower to given additional support. Hanson, Abstract. Hanson discloses that from the lower segment each successively higher section is made progressively smaller diameter tubes so that each tube will slip easily within the

proceeding section. In order to limit the distance a section enters into a preceding section, a ring 22 that butts the top of the preceding section is used, thus, limiting the distance the section will slide into the lower section. As such, the ring 22 does not constitute a plurality of anchoring elements being arranged along an axial direction of the second tower segment to prevent internal force concentrations within the wall of the first tower segment. As such, Hanson fails to teach or suggest at least this limitation of the claim. The AAPA fails to cure this deficiency. Accordingly, the combination of cited references fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim.

Given that the combination of cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Given that claims 2-12 depend from independent claim 1, which is patentable over the cited references, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-12 are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the rejections and objections have been overcome. If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Michael Mallie at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: June 16, 2008

/Michael J. Mallie/

Michael J. Mallie

Reg. No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300